

REPORT
Kindergarten to College Workgroup Meeting
Stakeholders Discussion
Document prepared by Barbara Ross
Helena, MT
April 1, 2008

This document provides a summary of the process and an analysis of the observations and recommendations made during a Stakeholders Discussion held as part of the Kindergarten to College Workgroup Meeting in Helena, Montana on April 1, 2008.¹ It was prepared by the discussion facilitator, Barbara Ross of Apple's Education Group and a member of California's P-16 Council under the direction of Jan Lombardi.

During a portion of the meeting, the Kindergarten to College Workgroup (Workgroup) brought together stakeholders from education, government, and business to discuss the issues and challenges to building a statewide technology education and research network designed to enhance education, provide equitable access across the state, and improve the economic opportunities of the state's residents.

THE PROCESS

Context

To frame the discussion and provide guidance to the group, the stakeholders first viewed a short presentation entitled "Did you know?/Shift Happens 2.0" by Karl Fisch and *xPlane* which is posted on the web at various locations including YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pMcfrLYDm2U>. The presentation is designed to provoke conversations about what today's students are going to need to be successful in the 21st century, and what impact this has on what they do in the classrooms of today. Mr. Fisch credits the content as having been gathered from futurists David Warlick, Thomas Friedman, Ian Jukes, Ray Kurzweil and others.²

After a brief reflection on the video, Barbara Ross further challenged the group to think about the design of the education system needed to support 21st century learners and their career needs. The group considered data from National Center for Educational Statistics and information from researchers such as Todd Wagner of Harvard regarding technology trends and the impacts of these trends on educational designs and workforce development.

Discussion Design

With the framework presented, the stakeholders were asked to form three discussion groups based on affiliation. The K-12 group was facilitated by Erin Williams and included Steve Meloy, Linda McCulloch, Kim Schwabe, Vicki Turner, Nancy Hall and Marco Ferro. The Higher Education group included Janine Pease, Tyler Trevor, Jeff Crews, Bobbie Evans, Nick Schlueter, and Terry Beaubois. The Workforce/Industry group included Evan Barrett, Dick Clark, Amy Carlson, Gail Gallik, Adam de Yong, Carl Hotvedt, Dave Gibson, Kris Harrison, Bonnie Lornag, Brett Maas, Drea Brown, Paul Reichert, and Kirby Lambert. Each group included Workgroup members as discussion leaders, recorders and reporters. The groups were asked to consider the same three

guiding questions and then share out to the whole meeting.³ The breakout design elicited differing perspectives of the stakeholders and also uncovered several shared and similar viewpoints. A transcript of the observations, ideas and recommendations is provided as Attachment 2.

ANALYSIS

The first question asked participants to list what Montana was already doing creatively with education technology in the state. Just a few of the items that came up were: a statewide distance learning policy, Full-Time Kindergarten, telecommuting options for the workforce, and already a significant amount of technology use in the classroom.

Independent researchers at the Metiri Group concluded in a recent review of technology learning initiatives undertaken for Apple, Inc., that while different groups look to education technology for different reasons, in general there are FOUR basic categories of focus.⁴ They are:

- Improve Student Achievement
- Advance Digital Equity
- Enhance Teaching and Learning
- Strengthening Economic Development

And examining the responses to Question 2 from the breakout groups reveal the same four categories are present. Each breakout captured ideas which can be described as **enhancing teaching and learning** i.e. *collaboration across boundaries, integrate virtualization, technology can bring back chalk and talk*. They also gave examples of improved **digital equity** as exemplified by these statements: *evenness of learning environment, allow more consistency, create more opportunities for students, issue of rurality, delivery regardless of location*. The K-12 group mentioned **student achievement** as an outcome while, the business group mentioned **strengthening the workforce** to their list.

When examining the responses to the question, “What needs to happen to create a technology network for education?” across the breakout groups, again considerable convergence of thought appears. The education groups consistently found important:

- **Vision and leadership** at both the state and local levels.
- **Resources** for potential needs (e.g. Adult education for parents, time for research and prep, collecting case studies and stories of success)
- **Strategic Plan** that incorporates these ideas to set the course with a unity of purpose for 21st Century readiness
- **Public/private partnership** to address connectivity issues across the state

Several members in this group *cited education initiatives, including use of laptops in classrooms*, in other states that stimulated more *home connectivity and wireless installations* mirroring the investments business is making to remain competitive.

SUMMARY

Currently Montana has many education technology efforts underway across the state. New work on a statewide distance learning initiative, an update of the K-12 Technology

and Library Standards, the Montana University Research and Education Network, commonly known as “lighting the fiber, and more residents using telecommuting options are just a few that appear to indicate a capacity for technological change at the grassroots level. In the April 1st Stakeholders discussion, there was an expressed desire for leadership from the state to build up a network that could leverage and sustain these current efforts and precipitate new initiatives to create a 21st century learning community for Montana residents.

Notes:

1. A list of the Workgroup members and meeting attendees is available.
2. Karl Fisch cites the following:
David Warlick, http://davidwarlick.com/wordpress/?page_id=3 ;
Thomas Friedman, <http://www.thomaslfriedman.com/worldisflat.htm>;
Ian Jukes, <http://web.mac.com/iajukes/thecommittedsardine/BLOG/BLOG.html> ;
Ray Kurzweil, <http://singularity.com/aboutray.html> .
3. See Attachment 1 for the guiding questions.
4. Apple, Inc. (2006) *1 to 1 Learning: A review and analysis*. The Metiri Group.
http://images.apple.com/education/k12/onetoone/pdf/1_to_1_white_paper.pdf